Finger-techniques for the zithers *sō-no-koto* and *kin* in Heian times

L. E. R. PICKEN

(*Jesus College, Cambridge*)

and

YŌKO MITANI

(*Sagami Women's University*)

From the Heian period of Japanese history (782–1184), there survive: (a) scores in tablature for the zither sō-no-koto箏のこと (Chinese *zheng*), and (b) contemporary descriptions of performances both on sō-no-koto and on kin 琴 (Chinese *qin*) which include technical terms relating to specific finger-techniques.

The scores include: (1) a manuscript fragment dated 718 (identified by Hayashi[1] as a *chōshi* 調子 – a modal prelude; we have been able to examine a photocopy in the collection of Professor Dr. Martin Gimm, Ostasiatisches Seminar, Universität zu Köln), apparently from the hand of the Tang-Chinese master, Sun Bin孫賓 [2] of Yongyang-xian 永陽縣 (Hunan Province), from whom the sō-no-koto tradition is believed to derive; (2) a mid- to late-Heian scroll in the library of Tenri University, *Ko sō-fu* 古箏譜 (further details later),

[1] Hayashi Kenzō 林謙三 , (a) *Gagaku (Nihon no koten geinō 2)*雅樂 (日本の古典芸能 2) Heibonsha, 1970). See pp.61–63. (b) *Sō no chōgen no gensoku to hatten* 箏の調絃の原則と発展 , *Tōyō ongaku kenkyū* 東洋音樂研究, Vol. 24/25, 1968. See pp.10, 12 footnote.

[2] ibid. (a) See pp.62, 63. This fragment is presumably that listed in the handwritten catalogue of manuscripts (held in the Library of the Imperial Palace, Tokyo: *Kunaichō Shoryōbu* 宮内庁書陵部) formerly in the possession of the

containing 28 items, all of which save *Ringa* (possibly) belong to the *Tōgaku/Tangyue* 唐樂 (Tang Music) repertory; (3) *Jinchi-yōroku* 仁智要錄 (the compilation and editing of which, by Dajōdaijin (Prime Minister) Fujiwara no Moronaga 太政大臣藤原師長, was completed between 1171 and 1192), containing the entire *Saibara* 催馬樂, *Komagaku* 高麗樂, and Tōgaku, repertories of the last third of the Heian period.

The source for descriptions of performance is *Genji-monogatari*, the novel by Lady Murasaki Shikibu. The relevant passages in that work have been commented on repeatedly by editors of the many recensions of the text since Heian times, as well as by musicologists – by Hayashi Kenzō[3], for example, and most systematically and copiously by Yamada Yoshio[4] in his book devoted to musical references in this famous, and even for Western readers (and particularly in Arthur Waley's translation[5]) unforgettable, novel of Heian court-life.

It might seem that, with so much critical comment already devoted to the elucidation of technical musical references in *Genji*, it was supererogatory to undertake a re-examination of these. That we have done so arises from two circumstances: first, study of the explanation of tablature-signs relating to techniques for the left hand in Moronaga's Jinchi-yōroku, and of the use of these in Moronaga's scores, together with comparison of versions for zither and lute (the latter in Moronaga's *Sango-yōroku* 三五要錄) of the same Tōgaku-pieces, has led to a new view of left-hand techniques for zither – that is, for *gaku-sō* 樂箏 – practised in the *Gagaku*-ensemble before the end of the twelfth century[6];

Fushimi-no-miya family. The entry in the catalogue (of which, by the kindness of Professor Kikuchi Yasuaki 菊地康明, one of us (L.E.R.P.) was able to examine a photocopy while working in Shoryōbu in 1972) is: 仲呂箏之部第七号孫賓十七中譜開元六年云云. In this entry, the characters 孫賓十七中 are from the first column of the eroded beginning of the manuscript; and the characters 開元六年 head the sixth column from the end of the manuscript and open an incomplete account of a journey to the moon by the emperor in the company of a Taoist adept.

3 ibid. (b) See p.24.

4 Yamada Yoshio 山田孝雄, *Genji-monogatari no ongaku* 源氏物語の音樂, 1934, 1969 (Hōbunkan)

5 *The Tale of Genji* (first published in one volume in 1935)

6 For a preliminary account of these observations, see Jonathan Condit: 'Differing transcriptions from the twelfth-century Japanese koto manuscript *Jinchi yōroku*' in *Ethnomusicology, 20* (1976), 87–95.

second, in the light of this view, some of the proposed interpretations of passages in *Genji* relating to sō-no-koto become untenable.

Before embarking on the discussion of particular passages, it is necessary to make certain general comments on the history of sō and sō-technique in Japan, both as gaku-sō (the zither of the Gagaku-ensemble) and as koto (or *zoku-sō* 俗箏) – the instrument of the *danmono, kumi-uta* and *sō-kyoku*, repertories. Originally, the instrument was exclusively in the hands of the nobility (a genealogy of teacher-pupil relationships, from Sun Bin and Minamoto no Makoto on the one hand to the Emperor Ninmyō and onwards, is given in the *Nihon-koten-bungaku-taikei* edition (henceforward 'NT')[7] of *Genji*), and *in all probability* there was no difference in technique of performance between the respected, but certainly imported and 'foreign', repertory of Tōgaku on the one hand and endemic court-songs[8] (such as Saibara) on the other. Unfortunately, the few entries relating to sō-no-koto which specify a tune-title are references to the performance of Saibara[9] – *Anatōto* and *Sakurabito* (*ryo* modal group), and *Nukigawa* and *Isenoumi* (*ritsu* modal group); none of the passages referring to left-hand techniques includes reference to a named piece[10] – for this reason the qualification 'in all probability' in the preceding sentence.

Important support for the belief that the Japanese tradition of sō-no-koto performance derives immediately from Tang-Chinese practice comes from the fact that two elements of left-hand technique are shared by the modern Chinese zheng, the Heian sō-no-koto, the Heian gaku-sō, and the modern koto. They are: the use of the left hand (a) to *sharpen* one of the open strings by pressing on the non-sounding portion of the string that lies to the left of the moveable bridge; the use of the left hand (b) to produce a *mordent* or *vibrato* by applying pressure in the same region before striking the string, and varying the applied pressure cyclically from + to 0 to +. Not present in modern zheng-practice is a third use of the left hand (c) to obtain a single or double mordent by grasping the string between thumb and first finger, to the left of the moveable bridge, and pulling the string towards the fixed bridge at the right-hand end of the instrument, thus causing the tension to fall momentarily, so that the pitch of the note also falls, but rises again when the string is released; a related technique is

7 日本古典文学大系：源氏物語，ed. Yamagishi Tokuhei 山岸德平，Iwanami-shoten岩波書店，1958–63, 5 Vols. See Vol. 2, p.449.

8 Musical evidence of the true character of Saibara melodies rests at present on the unpublished studies of Elizabeth Markham on the Saibara-repertory as preserved in Sango-yōroku and Jinchi-yōroku. Between Moronaga's zither-scores for Saibara and Tōgaku there are no differences in technique.

9 See f.n. 4, op.cit., pp.241, 242, 243, 245, 255, 256.

10 On two occasions, however, we are told of the playing of a tuning-testing piece in a particular mode.

practised by players of the Korean *kayagŭm* – a zither more archaic in several constructional features than either koto or zheng[11].

In modern zoku-sō practice, (b) (see previous paragraph) is referred to as *yuri iro,* literally 'the colour of yuri' (the meaning of 'yuri' will be considered later; see p.104). The third procedure referred to in the preceding paragraph (c) is *hiki iro* literally 'the colour of pulling', in the zoku-sō vocabulary. (See also p.105.)

Since Heian times, the technique of gaku-sō in Tōgaku-performance has undergone profound change in that use of the left hand has been abandoned. Remarkably, however, left-hand techniques survive to this day (as we have seen) in zoku-sō practice, though not referred to by the terms used in Jinchi-yōroku. It seems probable that the reason for this change was the slowing-down of the pace of performance of the Tōgaku repertory, rendering inaudible certain evanescent, left-hand ornaments when the attempt was made to perform them at a speed slower than a certain threshold-pace such that the amplitude of vibration of the plucked string had decayed to the point of inaudibility before the ornament was executed.

The precise date at which the left-hand technique ceased to be used by gaku-sō players has not as yet been established. Our studies have brought to light no documentary evidence earlier than Meiji, manuscript, gaku-sō parts, written at the end of the nineteenth century. It is probable, however, that the Meiji scores reflect a practice already established – perhaps one that had been in use for several centuries. Hayashi[12] states that the left-hand techniques must have been abandoned sometime between the beginning of the Sengoku 戦國 period (1467) and the beginning of the Edo 江戸 period (1603). This view was based on his observation that a manuscript from the end of the Muromachi period (1390–1570), *Eishō-bon sō-fu* 永正本箏譜, still exhibited tablature signs for left-hand techniques. This evidence is inconclusive, however, since a manuscript now in the collection of Mr Elling Eide (Harvard University) – *Kambun sannen sō-fu* 寛文三年箏譜 (1663) – reproduces a high proportion of the signs for the left hand to be seen in Jinchi-yōroku.[13]

[11] This technique is referred to under the general heading of *t'oesŏng* 退聲. The left hand grasps the string with thumb, middle finger, and ring finger, and pulls it towards the bridge, with the little finger stemmed against the string. See *Kayagŭmbo* 가야금보 by Kim Yong Ŭn 김영운, p.2, fig. (2). We owe this reference to Dr Condit.

[12] See f.n. 1 (b), p.25.

[13] We are indebted to Mr Eide for the loan of this manuscript.

In private conversation with one of us (M. Y.), Professor Tōgi Masataro 東儀和太郎 (formerly Director of the Gakubu of the Imperial Household) suggested that the gaku-sō tradition was handed down by the nobility rather than by the hereditary musician-families of the court, so that the *gakunin* did not know of the existence of left-hand techniques for sō-no-koto. Professor Tōgi states that even his grandfather, for example, who was one of the compilers of the Meiji *Sentei-fu* 撰定譜, probably did not know when the left-hand techniques were abandoned.

One of the oldest manuscript sources of music for sō-no-koto in tablature is Ko sō-fu in the Library of Tenri University. The date of completion of this manuscript has been estimated either as late Heian or early Kamakura[14], or (in the opinion of the Library Staff) as *ca* 1000[15]; that is to say, the scroll may be approximately contemporary with *Genji-monogatari*. Several features of the system of mensural notation adopted in Ko sō-fu (to be described on some future occasion) argue for the earlier rather than the later date. The relatively numerous references in *Genji* to the playing of sō-no-koto (some 40 according to Yamada[4]), and the technical precision of four of these, suggest that Lady Murasaki herself had a player's knowledge of the instrument. These passages, therefore, become an important source of information, to be used in parallel with Ko sō-fu, perhaps enabling us to judge how far Ko sō-fu enshrines contemporary, mid-Heian practice, or how far it reflects the practice of an earlier period, or (indeed) the parent Chinese tradition, from which the contents of Ko sō-fu undoubtedly derive since, as already mentioned, with the exception of Ringa[16], the items are pieces from the Tang-Music repertory.

With regard to the passages in *Genji* which refer to kin-techniques, these seem to antedate any similar Chinese comments and probably reflect Tang- rather than Song-Chinese practice.

Our locating of passages from *Genji* relating to zithers was facilitated by reference to the indispensable study by Yamada[4]. These passages are mostly to be found in Arthur Waley's translation[5]; but Waley's translation is free, and he adds explanatory material, necessary to the general reader's understanding of the text. The recent translation by Seidensticker[17] does not bring greater accuracy

[14] *Tenri Toshokan* 天理図書館 *Kogakusho ishu* 古樂書遺珠 (Volume 16 of *Zenpon sōsho* 善本叢書), Tokyo 1974, 4–54; commentary by Hayashi Kenzō, pp.11–18.

[15] L. E. R. Picken: *'Tenri Toshokan shozō no jūyō na Tōgaku-fu ni kansuru oboegaki'* 天理図書館所蔵の重要な唐樂譜に関する覚え書き in *Biblia, 57* 2–12, 1974. See p.7.

[16] In Jinchi-yōroku this piece is placed in the class of Komagaku and in the *Komahyōjō* 高麗平調 modal-group.

[17] Edward G. Seidensticker, *The Tale of Genji*, Knopf, 1977.

to the translation of passages of musical interest. For our purposes it was necessary to translate the text as precisely as possible. First translations were made from Yamada's citations of the relevant passages, comparing these initially with NT[7]. For reasons that will become clearer at a later stage, however, we have decided to adopt as our source-text that of the *Shōka-bon* 正嘉本 manuscript of 1258[18]. Our grounds for so doing are: (1) the observation that, in editing the text for modern readers (replacing *hiragana* in part by *kanji*), the various editors have inevitably introduced a measure of *interpretation* of the original; (2) the observation that the Kamakura manuscript (*Hikaru Genji* 光源氏) includes important, and possibly contemporary, glosses in kanji that seem to have escaped the notice of later editors.

It is then our intention, first to transliterate the four passages that contain explicit references to left-hand sō-no-koto-techniques; second, to translate these, phrase by phrase, keeping relatively close to the original, but at this stage not translating the technical terms that relate to left-hand techniques. Full stops in the transliteration correspond to intra-columnary punctuation-dots in the original. At a later stage, we shall demonstrate that the expressions used by Lady Murasaki are strictly technical terms, to be equated without hesitation with the definitions of left-hand technique supplied by Moronaga in the preliminary *Sō ampuhō* 箏聚譜法 in Jinchi-y-ōroku. We shall also demonstrate that the chief of these technical terms is a Japanese (rather than Chinese) term, in wide use in manuscripts of the Heian period, in notations for voice, winds and strings. We shall show, furthermore, that two of the left-hand techniques are implied in the manuscript-fragment of 718 (see p.105). Finally, we shall demonstrate the compatibility between the technical information in Lady Murasaki's text and the

18. Hikaru Genji (facsimile, Tokyo, *ca* 1930). Edited by Minamoto no Chikayuki 源親行 at the beginning of the Kamakura period (1192–1333). The Shōka-bon is the most important of the so-called *Kawachi-bon* 河内本 manuscripts. It is properly referred to as *Hōsa-bunko-zō Bishu-ke-bon Genji-monogatari* 蓬左文庫藏尾州家本源氏物語 (54 volumes) and is preserved in the Hōsa-bunko Library in Nagoya. The colophon (*okugaki* 奥書) affords important testimony to the authority of the manuscript: 'On the sixth day of the fifth month in the second year of *Shōka* (1258), following the revised edition of Rihō Chikayuki of Kashū, I meritoriously completed the writing of one copy. (Signed) Esshū Shishi Taira no (kaō).' 正嘉二年五月六日於河州李部親行之本終一部書寫之功畢 越州刺史平 (花押). The writer is therefore Hōjō Sanetoki 北條實時, one of the most distinguished poets and calligraphers of the Kamakura period. At the time of writing he held the post of shishi (scribe) in the district of Esshū.

contents of Moronaga's Jinchi-yōroku. In romanising the passages of technical interest from *Genji*, we have followed the Hepburn System of romanisation and the modern pronunciation, so that the transliterated texts should be intelligible to a reader of Modern Japanese. In general, the Shōka-bon text lacks the *daku-ten* that indicate voiced consonants.

I Sō-no-koto (left-hand techniques)

(a): Hikaru Genji, Daiyon, Momiji-no-ga (The festival of red leaves – that is, of Autumn maples)

Hitomeshite. onkoto toriyosesasete. hikasetatematsuritamō.
[Genji,] calling a servant to bring a koto, requested [Murasaki] to play.

Sō-no-koto wa. naka no hoso-o[19] no taegataki koso. tokoro sekere tote.
Saying, with regard to the sō-no-koto, that the marked inability of the thinnest string [*kin* 巾] to stand tension is troublesome,

Hyōjō ni oshikudashite shirabe-tamō,
lowering [the pitch] he tuned in Hyōjō,

kakiawase bakari hikite.
He played a tuning-piece only and

sashiyari-tamaereba.
handed [the instrument to her],

e-enji hatede[20]
whereupon she was unable to continue being resentful,

ito utsukashū hikitamō.
and she played in a very lovely manner.

[19a] In NT, 'naka no hoso-o' is interpreted as the 'i' string – that is, the middle string of the three thin strings nearest the performer in the normal playing position. These three (all of the same thickness) are, in ascending order of pitch: 'to', 'i', 'kin'. Yamada (op.cit., p.118), however, draws attention to a note in the old commentary to *Genji*, the *Kachō-yojō* 花鳥餘情. This is a work in 30 volumes, with annotations by Ichijō Kaneyoshi (1472), who used the Kawachibon text. Following Kachō-yojō, Yamada accepts that 'naka no hoso-o' refers to the string at highest tension: kin. We agree with this interpretation and suggest that 'naka no' is here used in the sense of 'among several'. Kachō-yojō is also quoted in *Genji-monogatari*, Nihon-koten-zensho 源氏物語, 日本古典全書, ed. by Ikeda Kikan 池田亀鑑, Asahi-shimbun-sha 朝日新聞社, 1951–56, 7 Vols; henceforth NZ.

[19b] Ichijō Kaneyoshi 一條兼良 : *Kachō-yojō* 花鳥餘情 (1472) (*Kokubun chūshaku zensho*, 1908). See p.59.

[20] Written 'e-eshi hatete'. Other recensions have 'e-eji mo hatezu'.

chiisaki hodo ni
Being so small[21],

sashiyarite.
she was having to lean over [stretching out her left hand];

yu-shi-tamō ontetsuki no ito utsukushikereba.
since her way of using the hand in the execution of *yu*[22] was so beautiful,

rōtashi to oboshite.
[Genji] was so charmed that

fue fukinarashitsutsu. oshiekikoetamō
he began to teach her while playing the flute.

(b): Hikaru Genji, Daijū, Akashi

Sō-no-koto torikaete tamawasetari.
[Genji] exchanging [biwa-no-koto] for sō-no-koto passed [it to the priest[23]].

Geni itosugushite kai-hikitari.
Truly he played in a surpassingly excellent way.

Ima no yo ni kikoenu. suji hikitsukete.
Playing a piece not heard in the present generation[24],

tezukai ito itō karameite.
his way of using the hands being very much in the Chinese style,

yu-no-ne[25] fukō sumashitari.
the sound of his *yu* was full and clear.

(c): Hikaru Genji, Dainijū-ge, Wakana

Sō-no-koto wa Nyogo no ontsumaoto wa.
As to the sō-no-koto, the sound of [Akashi-no-] Nyogo's playing,

ito rōtage ni natsukashiku.
in its extreme elegance was most appealing,

haha-gimi no onkehai kuwawarite.
traces of her mother's character entering [into her playing],

21 Murasaki-no-ue was only ten or eleven years old at this time.

22 'Yu' is glossed 由.

23 Akashi-no-nyūdō, formerly Governor of Harima, father of Akashi-no-ue.

24 'He played pieces not known (or: already discarded) in Genji's time' (NZ). 'He used fingering-techniques not to be heard in Genji's time' (NT).

25 'Yu-no-ne' is glossed 由音. 'ne' is written as cursive 祢. See p.104.

yu-no-ne[26] fukaku imijiku sumite kikoetsuru o.
the sound of her *yu* was heard full and exquisitely clear.

kono ontezukai wa mata sama kawarite.
The way of using the hands of this one [Murasaki], moreover,

yuruka ni omoshiroku.
was different again [from that of Akashi-no-nyogo] and delightful in its relaxed character.

kiku hito tadanarazu.
The listeners were greatly attracted,

suzurowashiki made aigyō-zuki.
indeed their hearts were utterly stolen by the charm of it all.

rin-no-te[27] nado subete sarani ito kado aru onkoto no ne nari.
Her techniques of *rin* and so on furthermore, all being competently performed, it was the sound of the koto played by a highly talented performer.

kaerigoe ni mina shirabe kawarite.
All changing the tuning [from a major-third mode to a minor third mode – ryo to ritsu – they played]

[26] 'ne' is written as cursive 年 instead of the standard 祢.

[27] The text has 'mu' for final 'n'. In one of the editions (NT), rin-no-te 輪の手 is replaced by *richi-no-te* 律の手. The editor states that rin-no-te is equivalent to the modern zoku-sō technique of *waren* 輪連 – ascending *glissando* over the set of 13 strings, struck by the middle finger of the right hand; that is, a kind of *kaki-zume* 掻爪. It is clear that rin cannot correspond to the *lun* 輪 as executed on the Chinese 7-stringed zither (*guqin* 古琴), where fourth, third, and second, fingers (in that sequence) strike the same string – an ornament deriving from the finger-plucking lute-technique of late eighth-century China. There is reason to suppose that, in China, the adoption of right-handed finger-plucking by lute-players, in preference to plectrum-plucking, opened the way to transfer of right-hand finger-techniques (such as lun) and the use of thumb, first, second, and even third, fingers (in forward and backward plucking) between *piba/biwa* and *qin/kin*. In Japan, where use on lutes of the large archaic plectrum of the Sui Dynasty and earlier periods persisted, such interchange of right-hand techniques between lute and zither was precluded, and Lady Murasaki's rin on the koto cannot be qin 'lun'. The meaning 'in turn' – applicable to the finger-action known as waren – is, however, a meaning also carried by lun in Chinese usage, for example: *lun yin* 輪飲 'to drink in turn'. Tamagami (see Tamagami Takuya 玉上琢彌, *Genji-monogatari-hyōshaku* 源氏物語評釈, 14 Vols, *Kadokawa-shoten* 角川書店, 1964, Vol. 7, p.370) draws attention to the definition in Kakai-shō (same editor and publisher, 1968): 'rin-no-te = rinzetsu", and the statement in *Gakkaroku* (樂家錄, 51 Vols, 1690) that Rinzetsu is a particular koto-piece. He concludes that the real meaning of rin-no-te remains uncertain.

richi no kaki-awase domo natsukashiku ima-mekitaru ni.
the ritsu tuning-testing piece, etc., so attractive in the modern way . . .

(d): Hikaru Genji, Daijūroku, Otome

Himegimi no onsama no ito kibiwa ni utsukushūte.
The Princess [Kumoi-no-kari] in her childish way was very lovely

sō-no-onkoto hikitamō.
when she played sō-no-koto.

migushi no sagariba kanzashi nado ate ni namamekashiki o.
As to the way her hair fell down: her elegant hair fell down on her shoulders captivatingly.

uchimamoritamaeba hajiraite.
Because she noticed [her father, Nai-daijin[28]] was watching her with affectionate eyes, she felt rather shy,

sukoshi sobame-tamaeru katawarame tsuratsuki utsukushigenite.
and she turned her side-face, which was very beautiful.

toriyu[29] no tetsuki imijū tsukuritaru mono no kokochi suruo.
Her way of using the hand in *toriyu* made him feel she looked like a wonderfully made doll.

Miya mo kagiri naku kanashi to oboshitari.
Her grandmother also thought her infinitely lovely.

The most significant observation to emerge from examination of these four passages in the photographic facsimile of the Shōka-bon manuscript is the glossing of 𛀁 in two passages, (a) (see f.n. 22) and (b) (see f.n. 25). The gloss is extraordinary, because 由 *is* 𛀁 ; the hiragana-syllable derives, through intermediate cursive forms, from Chinese 由 . It seems probable that the gloss is provided at these points because 𛀁 has a technical meaning; it is, moreover, a *Japanese* technical term, not a Chinese term, and *yu* is indeed a Japanese root. No Chinese use of 由 as a technical term in a musical context is known. Morohashi (Volume 5) lists a lexigraph 抽 (11930, 12699) with the same meaning and the same *kun*-reading as 引 *yin/hiku* in the sense of 'drawing' or 'pulling'. Morohashi gives no example of the use of this character in a musical context, but in Japanese use it figures in neumatic notations of Saibara[8, 45] and

[28] Brother to Genji's wife, Aoi-no-ue

[29] See p.104.

specifies the characteristic arched melodic phrase inserted when moving from final to the fourth below in those items now classed in Sōjō.

Hayashi[30] was certainly correct in supposing that the tablature-sign 由 was probably a Japanese creation. That it is indeed so, seems to us to be proven beyond doubt by the gloss: 仍由 ; for there is otherwise no meaning in equating an evolved hiragana sign with its kanji original.

The oldest Japanese document containing 由 as a musical sign is probably the copy of the *biwa-fu* of Fujiwara no Sadatoshi, made in 920/21 by Prince Sadayasu from an original completed in Yangchow in 838, in part by Lian Chengwu (Sadatoshi's lute-teacher), now known as *Fushimi-no-miya bon biwa-fu* 伏見宮本琵琶譜[31]. In the modal preludes included in this manuscript, 由 frequently occurs on the final, and at the ends of phrases ending on the final. 由 also occurs in the version of Sadatoshi's biwa-fu that is preserved in Moronaga's Sango-yōroku[31]. The *Gogen-fu* 五絃譜 (848), consisting of modal preludes and Tang-Music pieces for five-stringed lute, contains no 由 , however[31]. This might imply that this manuscript is closer to the Chinese tradition than is the Fushimi-no-miya bon biwa-fu.

由 also occurs in *Hakuga no fue-fu* 博雅笛譜[32]. Marett has shown that at least six different systems of notation are to be distinguished in this work, assembled in the tenth century, of which Systems I and II are probably the most recent and also show the highest frequency of occurrence of 由 . From two of these systems (V and VI), 由 is absent, and the frequency of occurrence of this sign in III is markedly lower than in I and II. While the absence of ornaments may be related to pace (as Marett explains), it may also indicate a manuscript source closer to the Chinese tradition, since the use of 由 appears to be a Japanese innovation (see above). It is to be noted that Jinchi-yōroku includes not only many *verbal* quotations from Hakuga's score (under the title *Chōshū-kyō*

30 Hayashi Kenzō: *Gagaku (Nihon no koten geinō 2)*, p.66.

31 Rembrandt F. Wolpert: *Lute music and tablatures of the Tang period.* Dissertation for the Degree of Ph.D., 1975, University Library, Cambridge; 'A ninth-century Sino-Japanese lute-tutor', in *Musica Asiatica, 1,* pp.111–65 (1977).

32 Allan J. Marett: *Hakuga's flute score.* Dissertation for the Degree of Ph.D., 1976, University of Cambridge. See also 'Tunes notated in flute-tablature from a Japanese source of the tenth century', in *Musica Asiatica, 1,* pp.1–60 (1977).

ōteki- (or *ōjō-*) *fu* 長秋卿 横笛譜, or abbreviations of this title – Chōshū-kyō fu, Chōchiku-fu), but also many *musical* quotations containing 由 (Chōshū-kyō was Hakuga's position in the office of the Empress Dowager's household – see Marett, op.cit., pp.4, 13). The musical quotations are associated with Moronaga's scores of *Bosatsu* 菩薩 (Ichikotsu modal group), *Manzairaku* 萬歳樂 (Hyō modal group), *Manshūraku* 萬秋樂 (Banshiki modal group) and *Rindai* 輪臺 (same modal group). *Netori* 音取 for Rindai for ōteki, biwa, and *hichiriki* 篳篥, in Jinchi-yōroku, also exhibit 由[33].

The sign 由 occurs too in manuscripts of Buddhist chant. Demiéville[34] mentions the existence (in 1930) of a manuscript of the Nara period (645–781) in the possession of a certain Professor Matsumoto Bunzaburō 松本文三郎 of Kyōto – a fragment of a text, entitled *Hokke sembō* 法華懺法 and provided with a 'very simple' musical notations. If this is the 'Shōmyō' manuscript to which Harich-Schneider[35] refers, she was unable to locate it. The nature of the 'very simple' musical notation mentioned by Demiéville has not been described[36], and the earliest surviving manuscript of Tendai Shōmyō 天台聲明 (dated 1131[37], and in the hand of Ryōnin 良忍, a successor to Ennin) is a Sanskrit hymn-text written phonetically in Chinese, entitled *Shichisan*[38]. The meaning of the notational signs is not explained by Yoshida[36], but the frequent appearance of groups of three dots invites comparison with the trilobed graph later used in Shōmyō manuscripts to represent a particular kind of *vibrato* (see p.101), and this interpretation is confirmed by Mizuhara[39], who identifies the

33 L.E.R.P.: personal observations

34 See *Hōbōgirin*, article *Bombai*, 98–113, 1930 (Paul Demiéville, Editor). See in particular p.98 column 2.

35 Eta Harich-Schneider, *A History of Japanese Music* (Oxford, 1973), p.307.

36 It is not mentioned by Yoshida Tsunezō 吉田恒三 in *Tendai shōmyō-gaku gairon* 天台聲明学概論, in *Tōyō Ongaku Kenkyū* 東洋音樂研究, *12–13* (1954), pp.1–96.

37 *Tenshō gannen* is 1131 (天承), not 1110 (天永) as stated by Harich-Schneider.

38 See *Hōbōgirin*, Fasc. 2, p.101, column 2 and Fig.42; Harich-Schneider, plate 12a (facing p.105) and p.318.

39 Mizuhara Muko 水原夢江, 'Tada hakase no kaidoku' 只博士の解読, in *Tōyō Ongaku Kenkyū, 16–17* (1962), pp.61–118. See pp.79, 80.

notation-style as closely approximating to *tada hakase* 只博士 (nowadays referred to as *meyasu hakase* 目安博士). This graph or neume is also to be seen in the second oldest scroll, written by Gyōnen 凝然 (1240–1321)[40], but the musical setting does not survive, and the neumes cannot therefore be read in the light of a living performance. Nevertheless, the present-day execution of both Tendai and Shingon Shōmyō establishes that the trilobed graph *or* kanji 由, *or* katakana *yuri* ユリ all imply a single or repeated mordent[41], in which the duration of the upper note is at least twice that of the lower note (see transcriptions of Tendai cantillation in Muko, op.cit., pp.116–118).

A further instrumental manuscript that exhibits extensive use of 由 is *Shinsen shō-teki-fu* 新撰笙笛譜[42], the earliest *shō/sheng* 笙 (mouth-organ) manuscript to contain virtually the entire Tang-Music repertory, completed in 1302[43]. Also to the first quarter of the fourteenth century belongs *Chū Ōga ryūteki yōroku-fu* 注大家龍笛要錄譜, the earliest approximately complete collection of flute-versions of the Tang-Music repertory, for which a date between 1321 and 1330 has been suggested[44].

Of all these scores in which 由 appears as an ornament, it is those of Shōmyō, and in particular the cantillation traditions of Tendai and Shingon sects which, in surviving performance-practice reveal, unequivocally, the mordent and compound-mordent character of the ornament. And it may be added that the scores of the Saibara tradition, from the time of Moronaga onwards, also include 由. Scores of this latter tradition (in neumatic notation, with flute pitches added to the vocal graph) dating from the fifteenth century and surviving in later copies, also exhibit types of compound mordent applied to final and fifth in ryo melodies, and to fifth in ritsu melodies[45]. Modern performances of Shōmyō and Saibara show beyond question that the essence of 由/ユリ (in *Saibara ryaku-fu*

40 ibid., Fig. 43; Harich-Schneider, op.cit., plate 12b and pp.319ff.

41 See transcriptions in Hōbōgirin, p.112, column 2; Harich-Schneider, op.cit., p.334.

42 In Yōmei Bunko 陽明文庫, Kyōto.

43 Laurence Picken: 'Japanese Music', in *The Musical Times,* December 1973, p.1240.

44 See f.n. 15, op.cit., p.5.

45 As observed by Elizabeth Markham (unpublished observations). See *Saibara ryakufu* 催馬樂略譜, Rakusaidō Collection, Research Archives for Japanese Music, Ueno Gakuen, Tokyo. We are indebted to Professor Fukushima Kazuo for a photocopy of

催馬樂略譜 also notated as 容由, 入節, or 入フシ) is a *vibrato* in which the pitch of the note falls and subsequently rises to its original level. The cycle of pitch-change may be unitary – a fall followed by a rise to the original pitch, or it may be repeated several times.

It has been necessary to describe the execution of 由 as a *vocal* ornament in first place, since the sign only occurs today in Tōgaku-scores for *flute* (ryūteki)[46], and here (as shown in Shiba's transcriptions – of *Yahanraku* 夜半樂, for example) 由 has the fixed meaning of a single, mordent-like, downward pitch-inflection and return to pitch, repeated by repeating the sign in sequence in the ryūteki-part, following the note thus decorated. It is noteworthy that here (as in cantillation) the duration of the pitch-lowering is shorter than the primary pitch. Marett[47] has argued convincingly, and in first place from observations on Hakuga no fue-fu alone, that 由 is a mordent. He goes on to show that at all points in the lute-manuscript, Sango-yōroku, where (for reasons connected with the mechanics of the lute) mordent-like ornaments are written out in full in tablature-signs, each note to be individually finger-plucked[48], the corresponding note in Hakuga no fue-fu is followed by 由. Furthermore, in lute-versions, the inessential note is (in general) a semitone *below* the essential note, confirming Marett's view of the mordent-like nature of 由.[49]

The nature of two types of mordent practised on gaku-sō in Jinchi-yōroku has been argued by Condit[6], who points out that the instructions for left-hand techniques in that manuscript may be interpreted in more than one way. Comparing parallel passages in Sango-yōroku (transcribed by Wolpert) and Jinchi-yō-roku, Condit resolves this apparent ambiguity and suggests that the gaku-sō equivalent of the finger-plucked mordent in the biwa-part is produced

this manuscript. See transcriptions of this source by Yamanoi Motokiyo 山井基清: *Saibara yaku-fu* 催馬樂訳譜 as well as transcriptions of contemporary Saibara-performance by Shiba Sukehiro 芝祐泰: *Gosenfu ni yoru gagaku sō-fu, maki ichi, Kakyoku-hen* 五線譜による雅樂総譜巻一、歌曲篇 1968, pp.282 to 303.

46 See, for example, *Tenrikyō Gagakubu* 天理教雅樂部 (1953) *Ryūteki-fu* 龍笛譜. See also Shiba, op.cit., maki ni (1969), p.236, bar 15; p.237, bars 11 and 15, and subsequently.

47 See f.n. 32, op.cit. 1977, p.10 et seq.

48 See f.n. 31, op.cit. 1975, p.199 et seq.

49 See f.n. 32, op.cit. 1976, p.120.

on gaku-sō by first pressing the string to the left of the moveable bridge, then plucking with the right hand, releasing pressure beyond the bridge, and re-applying pressure, in sequence. This is his item (3), diagrammatically represented as in Jinchi-yōroku, and defined as '*ni do oshi-ire*' 二度推入. There exists, however, another method by which to obtain a similar descending pitch-inflection, followed by a rise in pitch. This is Condit's item (4): , defined as '*toriyu ichi-do hiki yurumeru nari*' 取由一度曳緩也 (i), translated by him as 'seizing, pull and loosen once'. While giving the approximate sense, this translation does not explain the construction of the definition, and in particular it overlooks the function of 由. A succeeding definition (not cited by Condit) and represented diagrammatically by , reads: '*tori tabitabi hiki yurumeru nari*' 取度々曳緩也 (ii); that is to say, the slackening by pulling is repeated 'a number of times'. Here 由 is absent from the definition, as it is also in the corresponding pair of definitions in another early sō-fu: *Ruisō-chiyō* 類箏治要 (*ca* 1261).

Our interpretation of these passages is: that Jinchi-yōroku preserves a technical term: *toriyu* 取由 ; that is to say 'the *yu* produced by grasping' (as opposed to the *yu* produced by pressing, releasing, and pressing). The text corresponding to Condit's (4) is to be read then as 'grasping *yu*: that is, slacken by pulling once'. Where *yu* is omitted, the sense is (presumably) 'grasping': that is, for the two forms of ornament, corresponding to (i) and (ii) 'slacken by pulling once' or 'slacken by pulling twice'.

In addition to the observations of Marett on Sango-yōroku, confirming the mordent-like character of 由, previously mentioned (p.102), our observations have shown that, in the flute-quotations from Hakuga cited in Jinchi-yōroku (p.100), 由 is paralleled by 'ni do oshi-ire' on gaku-sō. Furthermore, such mordents are applied (in most instances) to the modal auxiliaries, in JCYR as in Hakuga (see Marett, op.cit., p.10 et seq.), and in both cases imply a pitch-inflection of a semitone. This parallelism suggests that the respective melodic movements on the two instruments at these points (由 and 'ni do oshi-ire') are probably identical.

'Toriyu' is a substantive consisting of two elements: the verb *to(ru)* 'to take, hold, seize, catch, capture' (Nelson, 1975) in the form used in compound verbs, namely *to(ri)*, together with an element *yu* in noun-form (for meaning see later), the basis of such words in later Japanese as *yuragu, yurameku, yura-yura, yure, yureru, yurugasu, yurugu.* It is therefore a compound of noun preceded by

verb in the conjunctive, *renyo*-form, used in the formation of such compounds. 'Hi(ki)' again is a conjunctive form of the verb *hi(ku)*. The construction 'toriyu ichi-do hiki yurumeru nari' is a form standard in definitions, *yurumeru* being a substantival verb, and *nari* a copula. 'Hiki' co-ordinates the clause with the following yurumeru – from the verb *yurumu* 'to slacken', itself formed from *yurumi + aru* 'that which has been slackened'. Moronaga's definition: 'Toriyu ichi-do hiki yurumeru nari' is then to be translated: ' "Toriyu" is what happens when one pulls once and then slackens'.

Up to this point the *meaning* of *yu* has not been considered. The reader will have recognised the compound technical-term 'toriyu' (in Moronaga) as that in extract (d) from the Shōka-bon manuscript (p.98). We identify the term in *Genji* with the ornament described by Moronaga, and in so doing we believe previous commentators on the *Genji*-text to have been mistaken in their interpretations. For example (NT): 'The explanation of 'toriyu' is (1) depress the string with the left hand before plucking with the right hand, then relax the left hand and again press the string with it; or (2) after plucking the string with the right hand, depress the string twice with the left hand without relaxing' (*sic*). But this is Moronaga's 'ni do oshi-ire', *not* 'toriyu'. Again (NZ): 'Toriyu is the technique of depressing the string with the left hand'. Both these interpretations ignore the graphic *grasping* implications of 'tori'取(in bone-script – jiaguwen – an ear and a hand).[50] Hayashi[3] equates toriyu with yu-no-ne (b, c) and yushi (a); but this is only a valid equation in the sense that toriyu is indeed a kind of yu.

The 'yu' element in *yu-shi* is a noun in form and is the basis of many words (previously listed) relating to 'shaking'. Its use as a verb requires the addition of the verb *su* (modern *suru*) as in the compound *yu-shi-tamō*, where *yu-shi* is the conjunctive form. The standard modern transcription is 揺し as in 揺し給ラおん手附 'the way of using one's hand in shaking'. The substitution of the standard modern transcription in the NT-text conceals the fact, revealed

[50] The existence in the vocabulary of Chinese qin of the tablature sign 撮 for a *chord* of two adjacent strings, plucked simultaneously by two fingers (normally by thumb and middle finger) might prompt a qin-player to wonder whether取 may be an abbreviation of撮. There are no grounds for such a suggestion, however. In the latter lexigraph,取 is phonetic; but the original determinative 冂 (Radical 13) with 'two' 二 enclosed, means 'to gather together', 'to cover', 'to include' '. With radical 64 as determinative, 撮 has an implication of doubleness 'to pinch together between two fingers'. Moreover, the normal abbreviation of 撮 is 早, not取. We may safely conclude, therefore that 取 is indeed 'tori' – to grasp. (We are indebted to Mr Arthur Cooper for these comments on the possibility of取 being an abbreviation of撮.)

by the Shōka-bon gloss, that ゆ is a technical term – the 由 of Japanese musical manuscripts at least from the ninth century onwards, and not so far recorded from any earlier manuscript. (It does *not* occur in *Tempyō biwa-fu*[30], in the koto-fragment of 718 – f.n. 1 – or in Gogen-fu[30]. Its occurrence in Fushimi-no-miya bon biwa-fu is presumably due to editing of Sadatoshi's original by the editor of the copy of 920/21, in all probability Sadayasu Shin-nō (see op.cit., f.n. 30).)

The Japanese root 'yu', conveniently written with kanji 由, means then no more and no less than 'a shake'. Whether the shake to be executed is a single mordent, a repeated mordent or, indeed, a *Pralltriller* (with *upward* pitch-inflection – see later) is a matter of secondary importance. The minimal shake is a movement from one pitch to another, a semitone (or, at times, a tone) away and back.

Shōmyō- and Saibara-practice show that the most frequent form of 由 is a downwards pitch-inflection. This is also true (see Marett, loc.cit.) of 由 in the flute-scores of Hakuga and also (as has been described, p.102) in modern ryūteki-usage in Tōgaku. On biwa, for mechanical reasons, a downwards pitch-inflection can only be obtained by finger-plucking, whereas *Pralltrillers* can easily be obtained by stopping the sounding string momentarily at a fret further from the proximal end of the neck – they are indeed the commonest ornament on lutes of all kinds. It seems probable, therefore, that the 由 on modal final and fifth in Fushimi-no-miya bon biwa-fu, and in the biwa-fu in Sango-yōroku, were *ascending* shakes (*Pralltrillers*). In other sections of Sango-yōroku, however (Saibara, Tōgaku, Komagaku), 由 does not occur or (as in Saibara) is rare (confirmed by Dr Wolpert), while finger-plucked mordents are abundant. How 由 was executed on shō is not known.

It is our contention then, that on sō-no-koto: ゆ し (glossed 由) and ゆの祢 (glossed 由音) both refer to the shake obtained by pressing-releasing-pressing (plucking *after* pressing); while と り ゆ is the shake obtained by grasping-pulling-releasing (plucking *before* pulling).

As already noted (p.92), both types of shake are still practised in the zoku-sō tradition, where ユリイロ (or揺色) yuri iro corresponds to Heian ゆ し (iro = colour = sound): 'the shaking sound'; and ヒキイロ (or弓色) hiki iro: 'the pulling sound', corresponds to と り ゆ. Examination of the fragment from the hand (apparently) of Sun Bin (p.89) reveals frequent occurrences of 放 'release' and 取 'grasp' written beside the tablature-signs that designate the

strings. It is reasonable to suppose that the first of these might be an abbreviation for a phrase such as 推放 'press and release'. The second might be an abbreviation of some phrase such as 取曳 'grasp and drag', or 取引 'grasp and stretch'. In addition, this fragment includes seven occurrences of 攬 which also has the meaning of 'grasp', and which exists in Chinese in a compound 攬取 with the meaning of 'seize'. The presence of these various synonyms for 'grasp' might be thought to imply that the technique of toriyu was known to Tang-Chinese zither-players. If so, it has been forgotten and does not appear in modern zheng-practice. The shake (either as *Pralltriller* or as short trill) is today indicated to zheng-players by the lexigraph 顫 *chan*[51].

A further ground for thinking that yushi and yu-no-ne refer in first place to the gaku-sō 'ni do oshi-ire'/zoku-sō 'yuri iro' left-hand techniques is: that both in Ko sō-fu (p.93), and in Jinchi-yōroku, 'ni do oshi-ire' (□) occurs much more frequency than does 'toriyu' (□).

Returning now to the four passages from the Shōka-bon text (a – d), there are several additional technical points to consider.

(a) 1. Since Genji reaches Hyōjō by lowering the pitch, it is probable that the instrument brought by the servant was already tuned (approximately) *either* in the *Ichikotsuseichō* 壹越性調 *or Sōjō* 雙調 tuning, since these are the only tunings of those specified in the opening section of Jinchi-yōroku (headed *Chōshi-hon* 調子品) in which the kin-string is at a higher pitch than in Hyōjō. 'Kaki-awase' 掻合 (corresponding to the *gen-awase* 絃合 for biwa, in Sango-yōroku) are numerous in Jinchi-yōroku. They are – as the paraphrasing term 'tuning-testing piece' (adopted by Wolpert[31]) suggests – short preludes, to be played over at the end of the tuning-process, in order to make certain that the various consonances between strings are true. 2. The significance of Lady Murasaki's having to stretch out is: that all gracing of notes (as Jinchi-yōroku shows) was performed by the left hand (as to this day on Chinese zheng, Korean kayagŭm, and Japanese zoku-sō). The transition from this statement to a comment on her execution of 'yu' is therefore appropriate. 3. That Genji should *teach* her to the accompaniment of his flute indicates the extent to which the *registration* of any tune by the sō-no-koto player was automatic, since the possibilities of registration are so limited (contrast with the kin) being confined to presentation of the melody in single notes or octaves (simultaneous or broken), graced or ungraced.

51 *Mincu yuedui yueqifa* 民族乐队乐器法 (*Zhongyang Yinyuxueyuan Bian* 中央音乐学院编) *Yinyue Chubanshe* 音乐出版社 1964. See p.66.

(b) 1. The interpretation of the ambiguous 'sugi' as 'pieces' (NZ), rather than translating 'suji hikitsukete' as 'he used fingering techniques' (NT), is to be preferred, since the following phrase 'tezukai ito itō karameite' clearly refers to finger-technique. 2. What can have been noticeably 'Chinese' about his way of using the hands is very difficult to assess. Today, the difference between zoku-sô and zheng-technique resides in such things as the *absence* from the latter of simultaneously struck strings a major second apart, the absence of hiki iro, the infrequency of simultaneous octaves, and the performance of shakes as *Pralltrillers* or short trills, etc. The greatest difference, however, is in modality, namely, the conspicuous use of major-third/minor-second type modal series in Japan, in contrast to the minor-third/major-second type modes of China. But there is reason to suppose that this latter difference was less conspicuous in Heian times (cf. the numbers of Tōgaku and Saibara melodies in ryo ('major') modes in Moronaga's collectanea). Harich-Schneider[52] supposes that the statement that his fingering was very much in the Chinese style refers to his using the left hand in gracing, as compared with the 'simplified Japanese technique' on gaku-sō today; but in view of the extensive indications of use of the left hand in Ko sō-fu and Jinchi-yōroku, it is to be doubted that gaku-sō had suffered such technical modification already in Genji's time. In any case, zoku-sō technique has remained unmodified; is *it* then 'Chinese'?

The discarding of left-hand techniques on gaku-sō was surely linked, in later times, with the development of *shizu-gaki-* 閑掻 and *haya-gaki-* 早掻 figurations in amplification of the simultaneous or broken octaves of Heian scores, thereby filling out the long silences that would otherwise have become noticeable in gaku-sō performance in ensemble. 3. The statement regarding the clarity of the sound of his 'shake' is of importance; it implies a rapid and incisive execution of the ornament while the amplitude of the excited string is still very near to being maximal.

(c) 1. Lady Murasaki's twice emphasising the *clarity* of yu-no-ne in respect of the performance of two such different persons (b, c), each time using forms derived from *sumaseru* 澄ませる 'clear', suggests that this was a feature of performance to which particular importance was attached, and that 'clarity' of shake was a stock attribute of a good player. 2. The comment on the 'relaxed' character of Murasaki-no-ue's performance reveals a nice musical discrimination on the authoress's part. 3. The implication of the last two phrases of the text is (somewhat surprisingly) that the ritsu tuning-testing piece (as well as other pieces) was played by all the sō-no-koto present, simultaneously. 4. Again, the nature of the 'modern way' and especially what might be so attractive about a tuning-testing piece played 'in the modern way' is difficult to determine from documentary evidence. In Ruisō-chiyō, for example, there are stylistic differences between the tuning-testing pieces *kaki-* (or *kun*-reading:

[52] See f.n. 35, op.cit., p.249.

tori) *awase* 攪合 (literally 'harmonising by grasping [the strings]') attributed to Sun Bin and the succeeding *bachi-awase* 撥合 ('harmonising by plucking [the strings]'); for example, the more frequent use of *ren* 連 and *hiki* 引 (written cursively) in the former. Again between the notations of *chōshi* 調子 (modal preludes) from the Inzen-fu 院禅譜 of 951 (cited in Ruisō-chiyō) and those attributed to Sun Bin, there is a somewhat more frequent use of 放 (see p.105) in the latter (as also in the fragment of 718). 取, though present in the same fragment, is absent from the Inzen-fu chōshi, whereas the sign for toriyu (p.106) occurs in the *Togen-jōchi* 斗絃調子 (ascribed to the *Tenreki onpu* 天暦御譜 – also tenth century). None of these points would seem to constitute a conspicuous difference in style – assuming that the pieces from Sun Bin are more 'Chinese' than others of later date. Simultaneous octaves are relatively rare in all these early chōshi, while broken octaves are frequent. The bachi-awase, however, includes many more simultaneous octaves than the following kaki-awase of Sun Bin; but the sample is too small to admit the drawing of any conclusions.

(d) There is perhaps a certain mechanical precision displayed in grasping the string and pulling it in the direction of the moveable bridge which might strike the onlooker as 'doll-like'.

II Kin (left- and right-hand techniques, etc.)

Van Gulik[53] discussed at length the question whether the term 'kin' in *Genji* refers to Chinese qin or exclusively to the koto. Notwithstanding the arguments he advances for the latter view, and the support these receive from certain Japanese experts, we believe he was mistaken in his thesis that kin always refers to a 13-stringed zither with moveable bridges. Our view, that 'kin' is indeed 'qin', is supported by the fact that this word (in the Shôka-bon manuscript always written in hiragana as *ki-mu* きむ, presumably reflecting the Tang-Chinese pronunciation: *g'i̯əm* – see Bernard Karlgren: *Grammata Serica Recensa* (1957), p.173, 651 q.) is but rarely glossed with the kanji 'kin' which may indeed stand, at times, for 'koto'. We believe that Lady Murasaki referred to the Chinese 7-stringed zither whenever she wrote ki-mu. Moreover, Prince Genji himself refers to decreasing cultivation of kin by musicians in his own day, and to the great technical difficulties of kin-playing (see Wakana-ge). These observations plainly do not apply to sō-no-koto. Yet again (see f, p.110), both the conditions (playing at night), and the technical expression 'yushi-anzuru', apply to Chinese qin rather than to koto. The type of qin-vibrato, referred to on p.111,

[53] R. H. van Gulik, *The Lore of the Chinese Lute*, Tokyo, 1940. See pp.197–204.

is more difficult to hear than the various types of koto-vibrato, previously discussed. Lastly, in the Akashi volume, Genji takes out his kin from its silk-brocade sack and plays a piece entitled *Kōryō*. This may be an abbreviation of the title of the famous Chinese qin-piece (the title dates from the third century): *Guangling-san/Kōryō-san* 廣陵散.

(e): Hikaru Genji, Dainijū-ge, Wakana
Kin wa koka-no-shirabe amata no te no naka ni kokoro todomete kanarazu hikitamōbeki go-roku-no-hara o ito omoshiroku sumashite hikitamō.

Regarding the kin, among many techniques – koka-no-shirabe and others – she played 5, 6-no-hara – one that must be played arrestingly – with impressive clarity.

1. No commentator has suggested an interpretation of this passage that is entirely satisfactory. Yamada (op.cit., p.95) (following Kakaishō[54]) favours the reading 'goka-no-shirabe' and the interpretation 'five techniques', namely: *kaide* 搔手; *katatari* 片垂 ; *sui-u-hei* 水宇瓶 ; *sōgai-ha* 蒼海波 ; *gan-mei* 雁鳴 ; but these terms do not seem to be known to the Chinese vocabulary of qin-techniques. Indeed most of them could be titles of qin-pieces, rather than names of finger-techniques. These same terms, however, are indeed names of finger-techniques in the *Tsukushi-goto* 筑紫箏 tradition[55]; but this tradition is not attested before the end of the Muromachi period, while the list of names occurs already in Kakaishō in the fourteenth century. An alternative reading of koka-no-shirabe, namely: 胡笳の調 , recalls the two famous pieces 小胡笳 and 大胡笳 , in the earliest collection of qin-compositions in tablature: *Quxian shenqi bipu* 臞仙神奇秘譜 (1425) (see later).

The Shōka-bon text clearly has 'go-roku-no-hara'. The reading 'hachi' (NZ, NT) would seem to be mistaken and due to confusion of two graphically similar hiragana syllables, 'chi' and 'ra'. In Chinese qin-practice, the term 撥剌 *boci/hara* describes the simultaneous striking of two adjacent strings with fingers 2, 3, and 4, of the right hand, inwards and outwards (towards and away from the body of the player). In qin-practice, the technique can be used on any pair of adjacent strings, usually with one string open and the other stopped so as to

54 Yotsutsuji Yoshinari 四辻善成 , *Kakaishō* 河海抄 (before 1367) (Edited by Tamagami Takuya from a copy of 1596) (1968). See Volume 13, p.486.

55 First described as the *gokasō* 五箇爪 in *Tsukushi-goto hiroku* 筑紫箏秘錄 in the tradition of the Priest Tokuō and Matsukuma Tōsen. See Kishibe Shigeo and Hirano Kenji, Tsukushigoto kenkyū shiryō gaku-fu, Tōyō ongaku gakkai, 1955. (Tsukushigoto chōsa-hokoku, Tōyō ongaku kenkyū, Vol. 28/29, 1969.

yield a unison or a fifth with the open string. The specification of a single pair of strings – as in go-roku (5, 6) no hara – is very puzzling. At first sight, it would seem to imply that the passage refers not to a finger-technique, but to a movement peculiar to a particular piece. Since (as already noted) 'koka-no-shirabe' can be interpreted as 胡笳の調 , it seemed appropriate to examine the various tablatures of this piece that survive.

According to the preface to Xiao- and Da-Hujia in Shenqi bipu (see previously), both pieces were composed by Dong Tinglan during the Later Tang Dynasty (923-936). This would make it very improbable that Lady Murasaki could have known the Tang versions of these pieces, since contact between Japan and China was so greatly reduced after the return of the mission of 838 in 841. The story of the Hujia-melody goes back to the Han period, however, as Quxian (compiler of the handbook) notes, quoting from *Qin Shi* 琴史 ; conceivably, Lady Murasaki could have known of some earlier qin-version. However, the technique of boci/hara does not occur at all in Xiao-Hujia, and occurs only once – and then between strings VI and VII – in Da-Hujia. Curiously enough, however, the version of *Hujia* in *Wuzhizhai qinpu* 五知齋琴譜 (1721) includes nine occurrences of boci/hara, of which three are between strings V and VI. The sources on which this famous qinpu drew are not known, however.

2. The alternative meaning of 'te' as a 'piece' rather than a technique must also be considered; but the specific reference to a particular pair of strings in the term 'go-roku-no-hara' excludes this interpretation; for while go-roku-no-hara might be peculiar to a single piece, it could not be so to many pieces ('amata no te').

3. In spite of the apparent impossibility of finding a satisfactory interpretation, there can be little doubt that Lady Murasaki was writing of the Chinese qin. The term 'hara', quite clearly written in the Shōka-bon text is a certain reference to a finger-technique used exclusively on kin and, as boci, specific to the kin technical vocabulary.

(f): Hikaru Genji, Dainijū-ge, Wakana-ge
Hiru wa ito hitoshigeku.
Saying: During the day, visitors are very frequent,

nao hitotabi mo yushi-anzuru itoma mo kokoro awatadashikereba.
even if we have time to *yushi-anzuru* (see later) our minds are agitated.

yoru yoru nan kokoro shizuka ni.
But in the evenings when our minds are tranquil,

koto no kokoro mo shime tatematsurubeki tote.
the very heart of the matter can be made to penetrate to consciousness .

tai nimo sonokoro wa on-itoma kikoetamaite.
[Genji] obtained the agreement of his wife [Murasaki no-ue] to his not visiting her.

akikure oshie kikoetamō.
He kindly taught [Onna-san-no-miya] day in day out.

In Shōka-bon, ゆしあむする is glossed with three Chinese lexigraphs. The first and third of these are clear, the second less so. Our tentative reading: 由按押 is confirmed, however, by Kakaishō (f.n. 54, op.cit., p.483). The Kakaishō gloss reads: 由 按アンス押をすなり *yu an/(anzu) osu/(osu) nari.* indicates – as for sō-no-koto – the presence of the technical term for a shake. Since 'anzuru' is commonly understood, in Japanese, in an abstract sense 'hold, consider, investigate' (for example, rather than the immediate Chinese meaning of 'to place the hand on, to press', the editor of Shōka-bon has added 押 *osu*/Chinese *ya*: 'to press down' with firm physical contact with a substratum, as in sealing. 'A shaking pressing-down' in qin-technique is 吟 Chinese *yin*; and it seems to us more probable that it is the simple, narrow shake to which Lady Murasaki refers, rather than the wider and slower 猱 Chinese *rou* (in the usual zither-players' reading). The gloss suggests that, in Lady Murasaki's time 'yushi-anzuru' would have required no explanation in the context of qin-playing. The Kakaishō gloss might be translated: 'Yushi is a shake (yu), an is 'press down' (anzu), that is, osu (osu).'

Ikeda[56] erroneously equates *osu* with toriyu (p.98) and yu-no-ne (pp.96,97). It is neither, but a clarification of *anzuru*.

[56] Ikeda Kikan 池田亀鑑, *Genji-monogatari jiten* 源氏物語事典, 2 Vols. See 2, *jōkan*, p.540.

CONCLUSIONS

This re-examination of technical passages relating to finger-techniques on sō-no-koto and kin in *Genji* seems to us to have demonstrated, in first place, the complete compatability between Lady Murasaki's technical expressions and the contents of the sō ampuhō in the Jinchi-yōroku of Moronaga. From the Shōka-bon glosses we see that *yu* is the tablature-sign 由, shared by instrumental and vocal notations in Heian and Kamakura times, and having the basic meaning of 'shake'. It is plain, from Moronaga as from Lady Murasaki, that the shake produced by grasping and pulling the string was distinguished (as toriyu) from that produced by pressure and release – the more common type of yu. In general, yu-no-ne was simply 'the sound of a shake produced by pressure followed by release and the re-application of pressure'. The character of both types of shake was mordent-like rather than *Pralltriller*-like, judging by Shōmyō practice and the definition of 由 in Hakuga no fue-fu.

It is surely of the greatest interest that these techniques are still practised by zoku-sō players, though they have long since disappeared from gaku-sō practice. Moreover, all the technical terms for shakes used by zoku-sō performers are different from the terms in Moronaga. The traditions must be preponderantly independent. It is clear, however, that the abandonment of these techniques by gaku-sō performers had not begun (as both Waley and Harich-Schneider have suggested) already in Heian times.

What was distinctively 'Chinese' about the playing of Akashi-no-nyūdō (p.96) is unknown. We have suggested that detailed examination of chōshi of various types, attributed to Sun Bin, may give some hint of Chinese elements by comparison with other early chōshi preserved (for example) in Ruisō-chiyō and Jinchi-yōroku.

As to the passages relating to kin, the most important piece of information yielded is the practice of a shake in which the string is pressed against (presumably) the surface of the kin. This can only refer to the type of vibrato known as yin in Chinese. The point is of importance as indicating, with some probability, that kin-strings were *stopped* with the left hand in Tang performance. Van Gulik[57] pointed out that all qin of the Tang Dynasty that survive have a smooth surface, in contrast to the description of inlaid qin of the Han Dynasty, and in contrast to the single surviving specimen in the Shōsō-in, the cyclical date of which (乙亥 *yihai*) was interpreted by him as a year in the Wei Dynasty, either 435 or 495. The change in qin surface-character between Wei and Tang was correlated, according to van Gulik, with the progressive development of the left-hand finger-technique, demanding a perfectly smooth surface. Such a surface permits firm stopping of strings, with sharp pitch-definition and good tonal quality, as well as permitting smooth glides and the

[57] See f.n. 53, op.cit., pp.181 et seq.

several types of shake – narrow and rapid, or wide and slow, for example. Lady Murasaki's mention of yushi-anzuru is compatible with a qin with a smooth and even surface.

One aspect of Lady Murasaki's comments leads us, *via* the glosses in manuscripts of the Kamakura period, to a new certainty regarding the meaning of the kanji 由. If we accept the date of 1000 as that at which her novel was completed, we can be certain that the root yu was in use as a technical term for a shake at that date; and, judging from the surviving practice in the execution of yuri in Shōmyō and Saibara (for example), this has been its meaning at least since the completion of Hakuga no fue-fu in 966. As we have seen, the shake was presumably executed as a *Pralltriller* on biwa, but as a mordent on flute, and also by voice in Shōmyō. It is of interest that the acoustic phenomenon is named by a Japanese root, while the actions by which the phenomenon is generated are named by *kun*-readings of Chinese terms, to be found already in the manuscripts of chōshi ascribed to Sun Bin, and in other early pieces for sō-no-koto, preserved in Jinchi-yōroku and Ruisō-chiyō. This suggests that the actions were first made known to the Japanese through Chinese terms.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We are indebted to Professor Fukushima Kazuo who kindly read and commented on a draft of this paper in 1976. Our grateful thanks go also to Dr Douglas E. Mills who examined in detail our translations of the *Genji*-passages and enabled us to clarify the grammatical nature of the terms 'yu-shi' and 'yu-ri' and to give precision to the translation of Moronaga's definitions of the various kinds of shake. One of us (M. Y.) wishes to express indebtedness to Clare Hall, Cambridge, for the award of a Visiting Fellowship and to Dr M. A. N. Loewe her sponsor, to Professor Morimoto Motoko of Sagami Women's University for advice on the interpretation of certain terms in Genji-monogatari, and lastly to Sagami Women's University for the award of an Overseas Scholarship, making possible our collaboration.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Asano Kenji; Nihon-kayo no Hassei to Tenkai, Meiji Shoin, 1972.
浅野健次　日本歌謡の発生と展開　明治書院

Hayashi Kenzō; Sō no Chōgen no Gensoku to Hatten, Tōyō Ongaku Kenkyū, Vol.24/25, 1968.
林　謙三　箏の調絃の原則と発展　東洋音楽研究

Ikeda Kikan; Genji-monogatari Jiten, 2 vols.
池田亀鑑　源氏物語事典

Ikeda Kikan; Genji-monogatari Taisei, 8 vols. Chuo-koron-sha, 1953–1956.
池田亀鑑 源氏物語大系 中央公論社

Kishibe Shigeo and Hirano Kenji; Tsukushigoto Kenkyū Shiryō Gakufu, Tōyō Ongaku Gakkai, 1955. (Tsukushigoto Chōsahokoku, Tōyō Ongaku Kenkyū, Vol.28/29, 1969.
岸辺成雄、平野健次： 筑紫箏研究資料楽譜 東洋音楽学会
筑紫箏調査報告 東洋音楽研究

Kogakusho Ishu, Tenri Toshokan, Zenpon sōsho, Vol.16, 1974.
古楽書遺珠 天理図書館 善本叢書

Murasaki Shikibu; Genji-monogatari, ed. by Minamoto no Chikayuki, MS of 1258, facsimile, Tokyo, *ca* 1930.
紫式部 源氏物語 源親行編

Murasaki Shikibu; Genji-monogatari, Nihon-koten-zensho, ed. by Ikeda Kikan, Asahi-shimbun-sha, 1951–1956, 7 vols.
紫式部 源氏物語 日本古典全書 朝日新聞社 池田亀鑑編

Murasaki Shikibu; Genji-monogatari, Nihon-koten-bungaku-taikei, ed. Yamagishi Tokuhei, Iwanami-shoten, 1958–1963, 5 vols.
紫式部 源氏物語 日本古典文学大系 岩波書店 山岸徳平編

Muromatsu Iwao ed., Kakai-shō, Kokubun-chushaku-zensho, Kokugaku-in University Press, 1908.
室松岩雄編 河海抄 国文註釈全書 国学院大学出版部

Muromatsu Iwao ed., Kachō-yojō, Kokubun-chushaku-zensho, Kokugaku-in University Press, 1908.
室松岩雄編 花鳥余情 国文註釈全書 国学院大学出版部

Tamagami Takuya, ed., Kakai-shō, Kadokawa-shoten, 1968.
玉上琢彌編 河海抄 角川書店

Tamagami Takuya, ed., Shimei-shō, Kadokawa-shoten, 1968.
玉上琢彌編 紫明抄 角川書店

Tamagami Takuya, ed., Genji-monogatari-hyōshaku, 14 vols., Kadokawa-shoten, 1964.
玉上琢彌編 源氏物語評釈 角川書店